



a court may deny counsel in a relatively simple case in which a *pro se* litigant can adequately handle the discovery process and the trial. Lovelace v. Dall, 820 F.2d 223 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987). Although a good lawyer may do better than the average person, that is not the test. If it was, district courts “would be required to request counsel for every indigent litigant.” Farmer v. Hass, 990 F.2d at 323.

Mr. Jones’s case is not complicated, and does not involve “exceptional circumstances.” Mr. Jones has one claim of excessive use of force against one defendant. Mr. Jones is aware of the facts of his case as they are within his personal experience and to date, he has articulated his claims quite plainly and has diligently proceeded with the case.

For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES the plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel (docket #2).

SO ORDERED

Dated this 26th Day of February, 2007

S/Christopher A. Nuechterlein  
Christopher A. Nuechterlein  
United States Magistrate Judge